

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

David Bryant Wicks,)	Civil Action No.: 4:16-cv-03652-RBH-TER
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
Hon. Nikki R. Haley, Sheriff Kenny Boone,)	
E.L. Clements, III, Connie Reel-Shearin,)	
James W. Carter, Anita Scott, Angie N.)	
West, Rick Ervin, Sgt. Huggins, Sheriff)	
Kevin L. Auten, Sgt. Marielle Kruk, Jeff)	
Johnson, William V. Meetze, Sgt.)	
Christopher Niel, and Hon. McCrory,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

Plaintiff David Bryant Wicks, proceeding pro se, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *See* ECF No. 1. Plaintiff subsequently filed a motion captioned “Petition for an Emergency Protection from Abuse Act.” *See* ECF No. 13. The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (R & R) of United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. *See* R & R, ECF No. 20. The Magistrate Judge has construed Plaintiff’s motion as one for a preliminary injunction, and the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court deny this motion. R & R at 2.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the R & R to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit

the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Plaintiff has not filed objections to the R & R, and the time for doing so has expired.¹ In the absence of objections to the R & R, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199-200 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation'" (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note)).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error and hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the R & R [ECF No. 20] of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction [ECF No. 13]. The Court recommits this case to the Magistrate Judge for further pretrial handling.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Florence, South Carolina
January 12, 2017

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
United States District Judge

¹ Objections to the R & R were due by December 27, 2016. *See* ECF No. 20. Plaintiff filed two letters within the time for filing objections, *see* ECF Nos. 24 & 26, but neither letter contains any opposition to the Magistrate Judge's recommendation.